Draft version November 29, 2016
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style AASTeX6 v. 1.0

arXiv:1611.08616v1 [astro-ph.EP] 25 Nov 2016

METAL ENRICHMENT LEADS TO LOW ATMOSPHERIC C/O RATIOS IN TRANSITING GIANT EXOPLANETS

Néstor Espinoza[1,2], Jonathan J. Fortney[3], Yamila Miguel[4], Daniel Thorngren[5] & Ruth Murray-Clay[3]

[1]Instituto de Astrofísica, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, 782-0436 Macul, Santiago, Chile.

[2]Millennium Institute of Astrophysics, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, 782-0436 Macul, Santiago, Chile.

[3]Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA.

[4]Laboratoire Lagrange, UMR 7293, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis, CNRS, Observatorie de la Cote dAzur, Blvd de l'Observatorie, CS 34229, 06304 Nice cedex 4, France.

[5]Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA.

ABSTRACT

We predict the carbon-to-oxygen (C/O) ratios in the hydrogen-helium envelope and atmospheres of a sample of nearly 50 relatively cool ($T_{eq} < 1000$ K) transiting gas giant planets. The method involves planetary envelope metallicity estimates that use the structure models of Thorngren et al. (2016) and the disk and planetary accretion model of Öberg et al. (2011). We find that nearly all of these planets are strongly metal-enriched which, coupled with the fact that solid material is the main deliverer of metals in the protoplanetary disk, implies that the substellar C/O ratios of their accreted solid material dominate compared to the enhanced C/O ratio of their accreted gaseous component. We predict that these planets will have atmospheres that are typically reduced in their C/O compared to parent star values independent of the assessed formation locations, with C/O < 1 a nearly universal outcome within the framework of the model. We expect water vapor absorption features to be ubiquitous in the atmospheres of these planets, and by extension, other gas giants.

Keywords: protoplanetary disks — planet-disk interactions — planets and satellites: atmospheres — planets and satellites: composition — planets and satellites: formation

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years there has been a significant push in exoplanet characterization to better understand the carbon-to-oxygen (C/O) ratios in the atmospheres of gas giant exoplanets. This has been in particular motivated by the connections that can potentially be made to the formation location and accretion history of the planets (see, e.g., Madhusudhan et al. 2011; Öberg et al. 2011; Madhusudhan 2012; Mordasini et al. 2016). This work is also quite timely given that the *Juno* Mission at Jupiter aims to measure the planet's atmospheric water abundance via microwave emission, and constrain the planet's C/O, which impacts our knowledge of the planet's interior structure and formation (Helled & Lunine 2014).

As is known in our solar system (Atreya et al. 2016), giant planet's atmospheres need not take on the composition of their parent stars. Instead, the composition of the atmospheres is defined by the accretion of gas and solids, with the composition of these species dictated by the position of the planet in the protoplanetary disk, which in turn defines how much of each element is available in solid and gas form. This idea has been one of the key arguments in order to link planet formation and the composition of giant planet atmospheres (see, e.g., Madhusudhan 2012; Madhusudhan et al. 2011; Öberg et al. 2011).

There may well be additional tracers of formation and accretion history, but C/O ratios have driven the attention of the community mainly because of their potentially large observational effects. For example, water features in the infrared weaken or disappear in hot exoplanets for C/O $\gtrsim 1$ according to chemical equilibrium calculations, because the water vapor abundance is strongly reduced (Madhusudhan 2012). This prediction has motivated several studies that aim to detect water vapor, in particular in transmission spectra, because the presence of a water feature could then constrain a low C/O ratio in those hot exoplanet atmospheres, even though the exact ratio cannot be determined.

Due to the presence of clouds, however, the detection of water vapor, and any first constraint on C/O ratios has been a very challenging problem (Sing et al. 2016). In fact, to date the only transiting exoplanet for which

the C/O ratio has been constrained with this technique is WASP-12b, which has been shown to have C/O < 1 at the terminator region (at 3-sigma confidence Kreidberg et al. 2015). Other techniques have provided constrains as well. For example, the C/O ratios of the four directly imaged planets orbiting HR8799 have been recently estimated by Lavie et al. (2016). Observations of directly imaged planets are typically aided by a wider spectral range for observations, including both O-bearing and C-bearing molecules. From HR 8799 system, Lavie et al. (2016) suggest the two inner planets (at ~ 14 and ~ 25 AU) show at least 30 times lower-than-stellar C/O ratios, while the two outer planets (at ~ 38 and ~ 68 AU) show ~ 1.5 larger-than-stellar C/O ratios.

Öberg et al. (2011) provided a partial framework for understanding the C/O ratio of gas giants within a simple disk, where the C/O ratio of the solids and gas were altered via condensation, which varies with the location of ice lines. Typically, the condensation of H_2O and CO_2 increase the C/O ratio of the remaining gas compared to solar abundances, while depressing the C/O of solids. This has been taken by much of the community as a "prediction" that planets that form in disks via core accretion, since they accrete potentially hundreds of Earth masses of gas, should be enhanced in C/O compared to their stars. However, this logic ignores the important, and potentially dominant reservoir of C and O of the solid material in the disk.

Knowledge of the total amount of solid material accreted by gas giant planets could lead to a better understanding of the C/O ratio of their envelopes and visible atmospheres. For example, if the amount of solids accreted is negligible, then the composition of the planetary envelope will follow the composition of the gas in the protoplanetary disk which can, if accreted in certain parts of the disk, allow for larger-than-stellar C/O ratios (Öberg et al. 2011; Oberg & Bergin 2016). Similarly, if we knew that a planetary envelope and atmosphere is polluted with a large amount of solid material, then the atmosphere would have a lower-than-stellar C/O ratio, due to the oxygen-rich nature of the solid material in comparison with the gas in the protoplanetary disk.

There is a sample of planets for which we can make an assessment of the amount of accreted solids in their H/He-dominated envelopes. Thorngren et al. (2016) has recently shown, using a sample of 47 warm transiting giant exoplanets ($T_{\rm eq} < 1000$K), whose radii are not affected by radius inflation processes, that these giant planets, as a class, are metal enriched in comparison to their parent stars. In particular, their calculations show that these planets have metal masses that range from tens to hundred of Earth-masses, and which therefore make an important part of the bulk mass of the planets. Given that it is unlikely that all that mass is in the core, this suggest that the envelopes of these giant extrasolar planets are highly enriched with metals, which is supported by models of planet accretion (Fortney et al. 2013; Venturini et al. 2015, 2016; Mordasini et al. 2016). Given that solid material is the main deliverer of metals in planetary envelopes (due to the fact that the metal fraction of solid material is essentially one, while the metal fraction in the gas is closer to $\sim 1\%$), the work of Thorngren et al. (2016) provides us then with estimates for the amount of solid material in the envelopes of these exoplanets, which in turn can be used to estimate the C/O ratios in their envelopes.

In this letter, we provide estimates for the C/O ratios for the sample of planets in Thorngren et al. (2016). We do this by using the simple static accretion model of Öberg et al. (2011), which assumes the envelope gas and solid material are accreted from the same region in the disk, although our main conclusions do not rest on choice of accretion model. We detail the model and our calculations in Section 2, and discuss the implications for present and future observational studies of giant exoplanet atmospheres in Section 3.

2. ESTIMATION OF C/O RATIOS

To estimate the C/O ratios of the Thorngren et al. (2016) planetary sample, we use the straightforward static planetary accretion model described by Öberg et al. (2011). Their framework gives the deviation of element X from the stellar value in an accreted planetary atmosphere as

$$a_X = \frac{f_{X,s}}{f_{s/g}} \frac{M_s}{M_g} + (1 - f_{X,s}),$$

where $f_{X,s}$ is the fraction of element X bound in solids, $f_{s/g}$ is the grain-to-gas ratio in the disk (which, as in Öberg et al. (2011), we take to be equal to 0.01, the observed grain-to-gas ratio in the interstellar medium), M_s is the amount of mass in the envelope accreted in solids and M_g is the amount of mass in the envelope accreted in gas. With this, the deviation of the C/O ratio of the planet compared to the star is given by a_C/a_O.

In order to compute a_C and a_O, we follow Öberg et al. (2011) and use the data in their Table 1, which compiles abundances and evaporation temperatures for CO, CO_2, H_2O, carbon grains and silicates for conditions typical in a protoplanetary disk, which in turn allows us to compute the fraction of C and O bound in solids (i.e., $f_{X,s}$ for $X = $ C and $X = $ O) for a given temperature, which we summarize in Table 1. In order to obtain the temperature at different positions in the protoplanetary disk, Öberg et al. (2011) use a simple disk temperature profile, which is a simple power-law profile of the form

$$T(r) = T_0 \left(\frac{r}{1 \text{ AU}} \right)^{-q},$$

where they set $T_0 = 200$ K and $q = 0.62$, which are average values for a large sample of protoplanetary disks (Andrews & Williams 2007). We use the same parametric profile here.

Table 1. Fraction of solids ($f_{X,s}$) by element as a function of temperature in the protoplanetary disk

Element	$T < 135$ K	$T < 47$ K	$T < 20$ K
C	0.25	0.25	0.375
O	0.32	0.52	0.66

NOTE—Fractions obtained using the data in Table 1 of Öberg et al. (2011).

The key ingredient needed to estimate a_C/a_O for the sample of planets are bulk gas mass, M_g, and metal mass accreted in solids, M_s. In order to obtain these values we use the joint posterior distribution of the total estimated mass for each planet, $M_{\rm tot}$, and the estimated mass in metals, M_Z. We obtain the latter with the method described in Thorngren et al. (2016). In short, the method uses the observed planetary masses, planetary radii, and system ages, along with giant planet thermal evolution / contraction models, to find solutions for the total metal mass with a planet that matches the measured radius at the given system age. These models place up to the first $10M_\oplus$ of metals in the core, while the rest of the metals that have to be added in order to match the observed radii are mixed in the (hydrogen-dominated) envelopes. In order to explore how the assumption of a $10M_\oplus$ core impacts our estimations, we repeat these calculations by assuming cores composed of $5M_\oplus$ and $15M_\oplus$, which clearly would yield either more or less metals in the envelope.

In order to estimate M_s, we note that the total mass in metals can be written as a contribution between the core mass, M_c, (whose hydrogen fraction we consider negligible), and the metals donated by the gas and the solids, i.e.,

$$M_Z = M_c + Z_g M_g + Z_s M_s, \tag{1}$$

where Z_g and Z_s are the gas and solid metal fractions, respectively. The total mass of the planet $M_{\rm tot}$, on the other hand, can be written as the contribution between the same core mass, and the total accreted mass in solids and gas in the envelope, i.e.,

$$M_{\rm tot} = M_c + M_g + M_s. \tag{2}$$

Finally, solving for M_s using equations (1) and (2), we obtain

$$M_s = \frac{M_z - M_c}{Z_s - Z_g} - Z_g \frac{M_{\rm tot} - M_c}{Z_s - Z_g}. \tag{3}$$

In our calculations, we set $Z_g = 0.01$ and $Z_s = 1$ in this expression, which are typical values for protoplanetary disks where the gas is hydrogen and helium dominated. Note that M_g is easily obtained by replacing this expression either in equations (1) or (2).

10,000 draws from the joint posterior distribution $(M_{\rm tot}, M_Z)$ were obtained for each planet in order to obtain the joint posterior distribution of (M_s, M_g), which was used to estimate the posterior distribution of a_C/a_O, the deviation of the C/O ratio of the accreted planetary atmospheres to that of the star. Figure 1 and 2 show the results of this sampling scheme for accretion at different positions in the protoplanetary disk for planets with different core masses, which are color coded: $5M_\oplus$ (blue), $10M_\oplus$ (black) and $15M_\oplus$ (red). The planets are ordered in the figures in terms of their mass: more massive planets are on top, while less massive planets are in the bottom part of the figures.

In general, the predicted deviations from the stellar C/O ratios for almost all planets fall *under* the stellar value (=1), with the assumed core mass having in general a very small effect. The reasons for strongly substellar values are simple. First, the amounts of metals (our proxy for the accreted solids in the planetary envelopes) estimated in Thorngren et al. (2016) are quite large, typically tens of Earth masses, or even hundreds of Earth masses for super-Jupiters, for in excess of "solar composition." Thus, the C/O ratio in the solid material in the disk, which has a large mass fraction of C and O, overwhelms the C/O ratios of the accreted gas, which has little C or O, in setting the total C/O of the accreted envelope. This, in turn, suggests that the accretion of solids, rather than gas, is what define the ratios in the envelopes of most giant exoplanets, in agreement with recent planet formation modeling work (Mordasini et al. 2016).

As can be observed in Figures 1 and 2, the assumed core mass has in general a very small but consistent effect: a larger core mass implies a higher (more stellar or super-stellar) C/O ratio deviation. The effect is most noticeable for less massive planets (which are on the bottom part of the figures). The only planets for which this effect is strongly noticeable are for the relatively low mass Kepler-30d and Kepler-89d, because the estimated metal masses ($8.70^{+1.95}_{-2.02} M_\oplus$ and $5.25^{+1.23}_{-1.10} M_\oplus$ respectively) are not significantly larger than the core masses considered here. This implies that if we assume core masses of the same order or higher to the estimated metal masses, then the planets are consistent with having all the metals sequestered in their cores (which is the



Figure 1. Posterior distributions (smoothed with a Gaussian KDE for visualization) of the deviation of the C/O ratio from stellar for accretion at distances less than 2 AU and between 2 and 10 AU in the protoplanetary disk for the sample planets of Thorngren et al. (2016). The colors indicate different amounts of metals sequestrated in the core: $5M_{\oplus}$ (blue), $10M_{\oplus}$ (black) and $15M_{\oplus}$ (red). Planets are ordered by mass, with more massive planets on top.

reason why the case in which we assume core masses of $15M_{\oplus}$ is not shown in these figures for Kepler-30d, while the cases in which we assume 10 and $15M_{\oplus}$ cores are not shown for Kepler-89d). If this indeed was the case, then larger-than-stellar C/O ratios should be expected on the envelopes of those planets.

It is interesting to note that the deviations from the stellar C/O ratios of almost all the planets peak at (or very close to) the deviation from stellar C/O ratio of the solid material, which is the deviation expected when $M_s/M_g >> f_{s/g}$. In this limit, it is easy to see that $a_C/a_O \approx f_{C,s}/f_{O,s}$. For the case of accretion at distances smaller than 2 AU (i.e., inwards to the H_2O ice-line), the C/O ratio of the solid material is 0.78, for accretion between $2 \lesssim r \lesssim 10$ AU (i.e., between the H_2O and CO_2 ice-lines) is 0.48 and for accretion between $10 \lesssim r \lesssim 40$ AU (i.e, between the CO_2 and CO ice-lines) is 0.57; as can be seen in Figures 1 and 2, most distributions of the C/O ratio deviations for the planets in our sample peak closer to those values. In Figure 3 we plot the median deviation for all the planets studied in this work along with the 16th and 84th percentile of the sample (for the case in which we assumed a $10M_{\oplus}$ core) along with the C/O ratio deviation of the gas and solid material for the different distances studied here. For planet accretion at distances $\lesssim 2$ AU, the mean deviation from stellar C/O ratio is $0.81^{+0.09}_{-0.02}$, for accretion between 2 and 10 AU the deviation is $0.52^{+0.18}_{-0.03}$ and for accretion between 10-40 AU the deviation is $0.60^{+0.13}_{-0.02}$. Figure 3 nicely illustrates the fact that, in our sample, almost all the planets show C/O ratio deviations closer to that of the solid material.



Figure 2. Same as Figure 1, but for accretion between 10 and 40 AU.



Figure 3. Deviation from stellar C/O ratio in the (mean) protoplanetary disk used in this work. Blue lines denote the deviation in the gas (solid lines) and grains (dashed lines) in the disk, while the red lines with gray bands show the deviation of the sample of planets studied in this work (median, 16th and 84th percentiles). Ice lines of the different elements considered are indicated in the figure.

3. DISCUSSION

In the present work, we have estimated C/O ratio deviations for the 47 warm giant exoplanets studied in Thorngren et al. (2016), and for which estimates of the amount of metals, here used as a proxy of the solid material in the envelopes, is available. Using a simple static model of planetary accretion, we estimate that most planets have lower than stellar C/O ratios in their envelopes, given their overall strongly metal-enriched nature.

If we couple this result with the observational determination that most stars (including exoplanet host stars) have C/O ratios lower than 1, as derived from high signal-to-noise high resolution spectra (Brewer & Fischer 2016; Teske et al. 2014; Nissen et al. 2014), then this implies that we estimate C/O < 1 for most of the planets in the sample of Thorngren et al. (2016), independent of where the planet formed as long as it was formed inwards to the CO ice-line.

The atmospheric characterization of these warm exoplanets via spectroscopy would be ideal in order to test our findings. However, due to their cool atmospheres and corresponding small scale-heights, and their potentially cloudy nature, the constrains that can be put on their C/O ratios today is quite challenging. For example, one of the planets studied here is HAT-P-11b, which does have a water detection in its atmosphere (Fraine et al. 2014). However, the precision and wavelength coverage were not good enough in order to put any strong limits on the C/O ratio of its atmosphere. If hotter giant exoplanets follow similar formation paths as their warm counterparts, however, this means that most of them will also have C/O ratios of less than one, which would in turn imply that water features should be ubiquitous in their atmospheres if equilibrium conditions hold (Madhusudhan 2012; Kreidberg et al. 2015), as long as their atmospheres are clear of clouds and as long as the observed parts of their atmospheres (e.g., the terminator region in the case of transmission spectroscopy) are representative of the bulk C/O ratio in their envelopes. If this is assumed for planets similar to WASP-12b, for which a C/O$<$ 1 has been found assuming equilibrium conditions in its atmosphere at 3-sigma confidence (Kreidberg et al. 2015), then these planets might be the rule rather than the exception, which would be further evidence towards the hypothesis that the weak water signatures seen in some hot exoplanets are caused because of clouds and not because of inherent water depletion in their atmospheres (Sing et al. 2016). Understanding cloud formation and composition in these hot exoplanets is, thus, key in order to interpret present and future observations of exoplanet atmospheres, and their effects have to be kept in mind

when interpreting observations (Kataria et al. 2016; Parmentier et al. 2016; Line & Parmentier 2016; Wakeford & Sing 2015). The high S/N spectra and wide wavelength coverage that will come with *James Webb Space Telescope* observations of transiting planets should allow a confirmation or refutation of these findings.

It is important to note that the model presented here is only a first estimation for the C/O ratio deviations of these exoplanets. Several additional steps could be taken if one wanted to perform a more detailed estimation. First, the abundances used in order to extract abundances of carbon and oxygen bearing elements, which were obtained from the work of Pontoppidan (2006) might change from disk to disk. Second, radial drift of the material in the disk and gas accretion should be taken into account in order to estimate how the snowlines and the abundances of the different elements that define the changes in the C/O ratios in the disk at the distances proved here (i.e., H_2O, CO_2, CO) evolve in the disk (Piso et al. 2015). Third, the time evolution of not only the planetary accretion, but of the disk itself with respect to variables such as pressure and temperature should be considered (Mordasini et al. 2016). The impact of these effects is outside the scope of this work, whose aim was to show an alternative interpretation to the typical picture of envelope accretion in protoplanetary disks, in which gas accretion is suggested to be the main character that define important abundance tracers such as the C/O ratio in planetary envelopes (e.g., Öberg et al. 2011; Cridland et al. 2016; Oberg & Bergin 2016; Madhusudhan et al. 2016). Given that giant planets are heavily metal enriched compared to their parent stars, we suggest that it is in fact the solids, and not the gas, that are the key ingredient that define these tracers in the envelopes of giant exoplanets.

N.E. and Y.M. wish to acknowledge support from the Kavli Summer Program in Astrophysics. N.E acknowledges support from the VRI/PUC grant, the CONICYT-PCHA/Doctorado Nacional graduate fellowship and support from the Ministry for the Economy,Development, and Tourism Programa Iniciativa Científica Milenio through grant IC 120009, awarded to the Millennium Institute of Astrophysics (MAS). J. J. F. acknowledges the support of NSF grant NNX16AB49G. Y.M. greatly appreciates the CNES post-doctoral fellowship program. N.E. would like to thank R. Brahm and A. Jordán for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

Andrews, S. M., & Williams, J. P. 2007, ApJ, 659, 705
Atreya, S. K., Crida, A., Guillot, T., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1606.04510
Brewer, J. M., & Fischer, D. A. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1608.06286
Cridland, A. J., Pudritz, R. E., & Alessi, M. 2016, MNRAS, 461, 3274
Fortney, J. J., Mordasini, C., Nettelmann, N., et al. 2013, ApJ, 775, 80
Fraine, J., Deming, D., Benneke, B., et al. 2014, Nature, 513, 526
Helled, R., & Lunine, J. 2014, MNRAS, 441, 2273
Kataria, T., Sing, D. K., Lewis, N. K., et al. 2016, ApJ, 821, 9
Kreidberg, L., Line, M. R., Bean, J. L., et al. 2015, ApJ, 814, 66
Lavie, B., Mendonça, J. M., Mordasini, C., et al. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1610.03216
Line, M. R., & Parmentier, V. 2016, ApJ, 820, 78
Madhusudhan, N. 2012, ApJ, 758, 36
Madhusudhan, N., Bitsch, B., Johansen, A., & Eriksson, L. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1611.03083
Madhusudhan, N., Harrington, J., Stevenson, K. B., et al. 2011, Nature, 469, 64
Mordasini, C., van Boekel, R., Mollière, P., Henning, T., & Benneke, B. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1609.03019
Nissen, P. E., Chen, Y. Q., Carigi, L., Schuster, W. J., & Zhao, G. 2014, A&A, 568, A25
Oberg, K. I., & Bergin, E. A. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1610.07859
Öberg, K. I., Murray-Clay, R., & Bergin, E. A. 2011, ApJL, 743, L16
Parmentier, V., Fortney, J. J., Showman, A. P., Morley, C., & Marley, M. S. 2016, ApJ, 828, 22
Piso, A.-M. A., Öberg, K. I., Birnstiel, T., & Murray-Clay, R. A. 2015, ApJ, 815, 109
Pontoppidan, K. M. 2006, A&A, 453, L47
Sing, D. K., Fortney, J. J., Nikolov, N., et al. 2016, Nature, 529, 59
Teske, J. K., Cunha, K., Smith, V. V., Schuler, S. C., & Griffith, C. A. 2014, ApJ, 788, 39
Thorngren, D. P., Fortney, J. J., Murray-Clay, R. A., & Lopez, E. D. 2016, ApJ, 831, 64
Venturini, J., Alibert, Y., & Benz, W. 2016, ArXiv e-prints, arXiv:1609.00960
Venturini, J., Alibert, Y., Benz, W., & Ikoma, M. 2015, A&A, 576, A114
Wakeford, H. R., & Sing, D. K. 2015, A&A, 573, A122

ALL AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS

And
Néstor Espinoza[1,2], Jonathan J. Fortney[3], Yamila Miguel[4], Daniel Thorngren[5] & Ruth Murray-Clay[3].

[1]Instituto de Astrofísica, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, 782-0436 Macul, Santiago, Chile.,

[2]Millennium Institute of Astrophysics, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, 782-0436 Macul, Santiago, Chile.,

[3]Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA.,

[4]Laboratoire Lagrange, UMR 7293, Université de Nice-Sophia Antipolis, CNRS, Observatorie de la Cote dAzur, Blvd de l'Observatorie, CS 34229, 06304 Nice cedex 4, France.,

[5]Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Cruz, USA.